

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

SECOND AMENDMENT ARMS, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	No. 10-CV-4257
)	Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr.
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.,)	Magistrate Judge Sheila M. Finnegan
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION
OF TIME TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE PLEAD TO
PLAINTIFFS' THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendants City of Chicago (the “City”), Mayor Rahm Emanuel, Superintendent of Police Garry McCarthy, and City Clerk Susana Mendoza (collectively, “Defendants”), by their counsel, Stephen R. Patton, Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago, hereby respectfully move this Court for a two-week extension of time, to and including November 15, 2013, to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiffs’ Third Amended Complaint. In support of their motion, Defendants state as follows:

1. Plaintiffs filed their fifteen-count Third Amended Complaint on August 1, 2013.
2. At the status held on August 1, 2013, Defendants’ counsel represented to the Court that an ordinance was under consideration by the Chicago City Council that would repeal or otherwise modify several of the ordinances being challenged in Plaintiffs’ Third Amended Complaint. That ordinance was scheduled to be considered by the City Council on September 11, 2013. The Court therefore stayed the filing of a responsive pleading to the Third Amended Complaint and set the matter for status on September 19, 2013.
3. The City Council enacted the proposed ordinance on September 11, 2013.
4. At the September 19, 2013 status, Plaintiffs’ counsel stated that he had not yet

reviewed the September 11, 2013 ordinance. The Court therefore granted Plaintiffs until October 3, 2013 to file a statement as to which claims, if any, they intended to withdraw or otherwise modify in light of the September 11 ordinance. Defendants' counsel requested 28 days thereafter – until October 31, 2013 – to respond to the Third Amended Complaint.

5. Plaintiffs did not file their statement until October 21, 2013.

6. Because Plaintiffs filed their statement over two-weeks beyond the October 3, 2013 deadline, Defendants respectfully request an additional two weeks, to and including November 15, 2013, to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint. Additionally, Defendants require additional time to investigate Plaintiffs' claims and prepare a response to them.

7. This is Defendants' first request for an extension of time to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint.

8. Defendants' counsel spoke with Plaintiffs' counsel regarding this motion, and Plaintiffs have no objection to the granting of an extension of time, to and including November 15, 2013, for Defendants to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant Defendants an extension of time, to and including November 15, 2013, to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint and grant Defendants such further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

Date: October 22, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN R. PATTON,
Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago

By: /s/William Macy Aguiar
Senior Counsel

Mardell Nereim
William Macy Aguiar
David M. Baron
City of Chicago, Department of Law
Constitutional and Commercial Litigation Division
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1230
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 744-6975 / 744-4216

Attorneys for Defendants